



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/086,710 | 03/04/2002 | Hideyuki Kazumi | 520.35833VV5 | 3298 |

20457 7590 06/04/2003

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

HASSANZADEH, PARVIZ

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1763

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

mis-9

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/086,710

Applicant(s)

KAZUMI ET AL.

Examiner

Parviz Hassanzadeh

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 14 April 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/979,949.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 4/14/03. These drawings are acceptable by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 12-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al (US Patent No. 5,556,501) in view of Schneider et al (US Patent No. 6,308,654 B1).

Collins et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Figs. 1, 2) comprising:

an vacuum chamber upper plasma generating portion 16A (*vacuum chamber enclosing a plasma generating portion*), wherein, as shown in Fig. 1, the upper section 16A defined by a (cylindrical) dome 17 comprising a cylindrical wall 17W covered by a *top 17T* at the upper face and supported on a processing chamber top wall 13 at its lower face (column 7, lines 19-48);

a *coil antenna* 30 for generating a plasma;

a *radio-frequency power source and matching network* 31 for supplying radio-frequency electric power to the antenna (column 8, lines 4-15) (column 7, lines 19-48);

a Faraday shield 45 comprising surfaces 46-49 disposed around the walls 17W of the cylindrical source in order to ensure plasma uniformity by reducing capacitive coupling (column 15, lines 3-58);

a *gas supply unit* (not shown) connected to a gas distribution ring 51 for supplying a gas into the chamber (column 7, line 51 through column 8, line 3 and column 9, line 64 through column 10, line 11);

a wafer support 32C (*sample stage*) for supporting a wafer 5, and an AC power supply 42 (a radio-frequency power source) for applying a bias RF frequency to the wafer support 42 (column 11, lines 41-60); and

a vacuum pumping system 21 connected to a vacuum line 19 disposed at the bottom of the chamber (*a discharge unit for discharging the gas below sample stage out of the vacuum chamber*) (column 7, lines 39-45).

Collins et al fail to teach the plasma generation chamber having a trapezoidal form in a cross section; and the Faraday shield being in floating position to a ground.

Schneider et al teach a plasma reactor (Fig. 10) including a plasma generation chamber having a conical dome 130 (*trapezoidal cross section*) extending from the side of the lower chamber 106 to a position approximately over the edge of the pedestal 52. The conical dome 130 is arranged to have a larger rim at its bottom side towards the wafer processing area and a smaller rim at its top side away from the wafer processing area. The conical configuration of the

Art Unit: 1763

wall assures good thermal contact and eliminates the air gaps present in prior art design. The use of conical wall shape together with conically shaped induction coil windings reduces the variation in the electric field in the chamber (particularly at the center of the chamber), while the use of fixed and variable pitch coil windings can fin tune the effect of the desired electric field (column 12, line4-49).

Schneider et al further teach a Faraday shield element 272 (Fig. 18) which can be grounded or left floating so that no ohmic voltage drop occurs in it while it is acting ad a Faraday shield (column 23, lines 44-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the conical configuration as taught by Schneider et al in the apparatus of Collins et al in order to reduce the variation in the electric field in the chamber particularly at the center of the chamber. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the Faraday shield connection mechanism as taught by Schneider et al in the apparatus of Collins et al in order to be able to leave the Faraday shield grounded or floating so that no ohmic voltage drop occurs in the shield when an RF is applied to the plasma generating inductive coil.

Further regarding claims 13, 14, 16: the apparatus of Collins et al further includes a third electrode 17T disposed in the upper section 16A, the third electrode may be floating, grounded or connected to an RF power source 40 as shown in Fig. 1, and the third electrode may have various configuration and can be made of various material such as aluminum (*conductor*) or silicon (*semiconductor*) (column 7, lines 19-38 and column 21, line 43 through column 22, line 26).

Further regarding claims 17, 18 : It was held in *re Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984) that where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al (US Patent No. 5,556,501) in view of Schneider et al (US Patent No. 6,308,654 B1) as applied to claims 12-14, 16-18 above, and further in view of Gorin (US Patent No. 4,464,223).

Collins et al in view of Schneider et al teach all limitations of the claims as discussed above except for a DC voltage source being coupled to the conductive plate (*third electrode*).

Gorin teaches a plasma processing apparatus wherein an electrode 14 may be coupled to an RF power source 36, to a DC power source 42, or being grounded through a series circuit 44 as shown in Fig. 2. use of the DC power supply allows the amount of DC biasing induced by the plasma to be changed independently of pressure or power (column 3, lines 4-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the bias power mechanism including the DC power source as taught by Gorin et al in the apparatus of Collins et al in view of Schneider et al in order to control the amount of bias independently of pressure or power.

Claims 12-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US Patent No. 5,772,771) in view of Collins et al (US Patent No. 5,556,501) and Schneider et al (US Patent No. 6,308,654 B1).

Li et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Fig. 1) comprising:

a housing 4 (*vacuum chamber enclosing a plasma generating portion*), wherein, as shown in Fig. 1, the housing 4 including a (truncated) dome 6 surrounded by the coils 8 and having its upper face covered by a top 25 (*flat and circular*) and its *bottom face* sitting on a processing chamber side wall 30;

a *coil antenna* 8 for generating a plasma;

a *radio-frequency power source* 10 for supplying radio-frequency electric power to the antenna;

a *gas supply unit* (not shown) connected to a gas distribution nozzle 34 for supplying a gas into the chamber;

a substrate support 14 (*sample stage*) for supporting a substrate 20, and a bias radio-frequency power source 22 for applying a bias RF frequency to the wafer support 14; and

an exhaust port 44 disposed at the bottom of the chamber (*a discharge unit for discharging the gas below sample stage out of the vacuum chamber*) (column 20-46).

Li et al fail to teach a Faraday shield provided around the plasma generating portion.

Collins et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Figs. 1-2) including a Faraday shield 45 in order to produce a plasma mainly inductively rather than capacitively (column 15, lines 3-58).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the Faraday shield as taught by Collins et al in the apparatus of Li et al in order to generate a plasma mainly inductively.

Li et al in view of Collins et al fail to teach the Faraday shield being in floating position to a ground.

Schneider et al teach a Faraday shield element 272 (Fig. 18) which can be grounded or left floating so that no ohmic voltage drop occurs in it while it is acting as a Faraday shield (column 23, lines 44-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the Faraday shield connection mechanism as taught by Schneider et al in the apparatus of Li et al in view of Collins et al in order to be able to leave the Faraday shield grounded or floating so that no ohmic voltage drop occurs in the shield when an RF is applied to the plasma generating inductive coil.

Further regarding claims 1, 17, 18: It was held in *re Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984) that where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

Further, Schneider et al teach a plasma reactor (Fig. 10) including a plasma generation chamber having a conical dome 130 (*trapezoidal cross section*) extending from the side of the lower chamber 106 to a position approximately over the edge of the pedestal 52. The conical

Art Unit: 1763

dome 130 is arranged to have a larger rim at its bottom side towards the wafer processing area and a smaller rim at its top side away from the wafer processing area. The conical configuration of the wall assures good thermal contact and eliminates the air gaps present in prior art design. The use of conical wall shape together with conically shaped induction coil windings reduces the variation in the electric field in the chamber (particularly at the center of the chamber), while the use of fixed and variable pitch coil windings can fin tune the effect of the desired electric field (column 12, line4-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the conical configuration as taught by Schneider et al in the apparatus of Collins et al in order to reduce the variation in the electric field in the chamber particularly at the center of the chamber.

Regarding claim 13, 14, 16: Collins et al further teach a plasma processing apparatus (Figs. 1-2) including a third electrode 17T disposed in the upper section 16A, the third electrode may be floating, grounded or connected to an RF power source 40 as shown in Fig. 1, and the third electrode may have various configuration and can be made of various material such as aluminum (*conductor*) or silicon (*semiconductor*) (column 7, lines 19-38 and column 21, line 43 through column 22, line 26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the bias mechanism including the grounding as taught by Collins et al in the apparatus of Li et al in order to enhance various processing characteristic including etch rate and plasma coupling (column 21, lines 60-67).

Art Unit: 1763

Further regarding claim 13, 14, 16: The apparatus of Li et al further includes a top 25 acting as an anode and is electrically biased by a second RF power source 26 (column 3, lines 20-47).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US Patent No. 5,772,771) in view of Collins et al (US Patent No. 5,556,501) and Schneider et al (US Patent No. 6,308,654 B1) as applied to claims 12-14, 16-18 above, and further in view of Gorin (US Patent No. 4,464,223).

Li et al in view of Collins et al and Schneider et al teach all limitations of the claims as discussed above except for a DC voltage source being coupled to the conductive plate.

Gorin teaches a plasma processing apparatus wherein an electrode 14 may be coupled to an RF power source 36, to a DC power source 42, or being grounded through a series circuit 44 as shown in Fig. 2. Use of the DC power supply allows the amount of DC biasing induced by the plasma to be changed independently of pressure or power. Grounding will change the electrode area ratio between a high frequency electrode 12 (plasma source) and a ground electrode 26 (return path) is changed (column 3, lines 4-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the bias power mechanism including the DC power source as taught by Gorin et al in the apparatus of Li et al in view of Collins et al and Schneider et al in order to control the amount of bias independently of pressure or power.

Claims 12-14, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al (US Patent No. 5,904,778) in view of Collins et al (US Patent No. 5,556,501) and Schneider et al (US Patent No. 6,308,654 B1).

Lu et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Fig. 9) comprising:

a plasma generating chamber defined by side wall 74 and a top wall 80 (*vacuum chamber enclosing a portion where plasma is generated*), wherein, as shown in Fig. 8, the housing comprising a truncated conical dome 70 having an RF inductive coil 72 wrapped around its outside, and a roof 80 (*a flat upper face*), and a bottom side sitting on a processing chamber (*inclined side wall around the portion such that the vacuum chamber has a trapezoidal form in cross-section*);

a coil antenna 72 for generating a plasma;

a radio-frequency power source (not shown) for supplying radio-frequency electric power to the antenna;

a gas supply unit (not shown);

a pedestal electrode 82 (*sample stage*) for supporting a wafer, and a bias radio-frequency power source 84 for applying a bias RF frequency to the wafer support 82; and

a vacuum pumping system (not shown) (*a discharge unit for discharging the gas below sample stage out of the vacuum chamber*) (column 11, line 15 through column 12, line 33).

Lu et al fail to teach a Faraday shield provided around the plasma generating portion.

Collins et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Figs. 1-2) including a Faraday shield 45 in order to produce a plasma mainly inductively rather than capacitively (column 7, lines 19-38 and column 21, line 43 through column 22, line 26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the Faraday shield as taught by Collins et al in the apparatus of Lu et al in order to generate a plasma mainly inductively.

Lu et al in view of Collins et al fail to teach the Faraday shield being floating.

Schneider et al teach a Faraday shield element 272 (Fig. 18) which can be grounded or left floating so that no ohmic voltage drop occurs in the shield while it is acting as a Faraday shield (column 23, lines 44-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the Faraday shield connection mechanism as taught by Schneider et al in the apparatus of Lu et al in view of Collins et al in order to be able to leave the Faraday shield grounded or floating so that no ohmic voltage drop occurs in the shield when an RF is applied to the plasma generating inductive coil.

Regarding claims 13, 14, 16: Collins et al further teach a plasma processing apparatus (Figs. 1-2) including a third electrode 17T disposed in the upper section 16A, the third electrode may be floating, grounded or connected to an RF power source 40 as shown in Fig. 1, and the third electrode may have various configuration and can be made of various material such as aluminum (*conductor*) or silicon (*semiconductor*) (column 7, lines 19-38 and column 21, line 43 through column 22, line 26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the bias mechanism including the bias RF power source as taught by Collins et al in the apparatus of Lu et al in order to enhance various processing characteristic including etch rate and selectivity (column 22, lines 1-26).

Art Unit: 1763

Further regarding claim 13, 14, 16: the top wall 80 is grounded (column 11, line 15 through column 12, line 33).

Further regarding claims 17, 18: It was held in *re Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984) that where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al (US Patent No. 5,904,778) in view of Collins et al (US Patent No. 5,556,501) and Schneider et al (US Patent No. 6,308,654 B1) as applied to claims 12-14, 16-18 above, and further in view of Gorin (US Patent No. 4,464,223).

Lu et al in view of Collins et al and Schneider et al teach all limitations of the claims as discussed above except for a DC voltage source is coupled to the conductive plated.

Gorin teaches a plasma processing apparatus wherein an electrode 14 may be coupled to an RF power source 36, to a DC power source 42, or being grounded through a series circuit 44 as shown in Fig. 2. Use of the DC power supply allows the amount of DC biasing induced by the plasma to be changed independently of pressure or power. Grounding will change the electrode area ratio between a high frequency electrode 12 (plasma source) and a ground electrode 26 (return path) is changed (column 3, lines 4-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the bias power mechanism including the DC power source as taught by

Gorin et al in the apparatus of Lu et al in view of Collins et al and Schneider et al in order to control the amount of bias independently of pressure or power.

Claims 12, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al (US Patent No. 5,904,778) in view of Savas et al (US Patent No. 5,811,022).

Lu et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Fig. 9) comprising:

a plasma generating chamber defined by side wall 74 and a top wall 80 (*vacuum chamber enclosing a portion where plasma is generated*), wherein, as shown in Fig. 8, the housing comprising a truncated conical dome 70 having an RF inductive coil 72 wrapped around its outside; and a roof 80 (*a flat upper face*), and a bottom side sitting on a processing chamber (*inclined side wall around the portion such that the vacuum chamber has a trapezoidal form in cross-section*);

a coil antenna 72 for generating a plasma;

a radio-frequency power source (*not shown*) for supplying radio-frequency electric power to the antenna;

a gas supply unit (*not shown*);

a pedestal electrode 82 (*sample stage*) for supporting a wafer, and a bias radio-frequency power source 84 for applying a bias RF frequency to the wafer support 82; and

a vacuum pumping system (*not shown*) (*a discharge unit for discharging the gas below sample stage out of the vacuum chamber*) (column 11, line 15 through column 12, line 33).

Lu et al fail to teach a Faraday shield provided around the plasma generating portion, wherein the shield is at a floating potential.

Savas et al teach a Faraday shield element 64 (Figs. 10, 11) disposed between an induction coil 42 and a plasma generation chamber 41 in order to reduce capacitive coupling between the antenna coil and the plasma, wherein the Faraday shield 64 may be grounded through an adjustable impedance Z_s (column 19, line 22-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the Faraday shield mechanism as taught by Savas et al in the apparatus of Lu et al in order to reduce capacitive coupling.

Further regarding claims 17, 18: It was held in *re Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984) that where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device.

Claims 13, 14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al (US Patent No. 5,904,778) in view of Savas et al (US Patent No. 5,811,022) as applied to claims 12, 17, 18 above, and further in view of Collins et al (US Patent No. 5,556,501).

Lu et al in view of Savas et al teach all limitations of the claims as discussed above except for a plate made of a conductor or semiconductor and placed on an inner side of the upper face of the vacuum chamber.

Collins et al teach a plasma processing apparatus (Figs. 1-2) including a third electrode 17T disposed in the upper section 16A, the third electrode may be floating, grounded or connected to an RF power source 40 as shown in Fig. 1, and the third electrode may have various

Art Unit: 1763

configuration and can be made of various material such as aluminum (*conductor*) or silicon (*semiconductor*) (column 7, lines 19-38 and column 21, line 43 through column 22, line 26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the bias mechanism including the bias RF power source as taught by Collins et al in the apparatus of Lu et al in view of Savas et al in order to enhance various processing characteristic including etch rate and selectivity (column 22, lines 1-26).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al (US Patent No. 5,904,778) in view of Savas et al (US Patent No. 5,811,022) and Collins et al (US Patent No. 5,556,501) as applied to claims 12-14, 16-18 above, and further in view of Gorin (US Patent No. 4,464,223).

Lu et al in view of Savas et al and Collins et al teach all limitations of the claims as discussed above except for a DC voltage source is coupled to the conductive plated.

Gorin teaches a plasma processing apparatus wherein an electrode 14 may be coupled to an RF power source 36, to a DC power source 42, or being grounded through a series circuit 44 as shown in Fig. 2. Use of the DC power supply allows the amount of DC biasing induced by the plasma to be changed independently of pressure or power. Grounding will change the electrode area ratio between a high frequency electrode 12 (plasma source) and a ground electrode 26 (return path) is changed (column 3, lines 4-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the bias power mechanism including the DC power source as taught by Gorin et al in the apparatus of Lu et al in view of Savas and Collins et al in order to control the amount of bias independently of pressure or power.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/14/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants assert that Collins et al do not teach a plasma generation chamber having a trapezoidal form in a cross section; and Collins et al do not teach Faraday shield being in floating position to a ground.

The Examiner has revised the anticipation rejection into an obviousness rejection using Schneider et al for teach a Trapezoidal shaped plasma generation chamber and for teaching a floating Faraday shield.

Applicants assert that Li et al do not teach a plasma generation chamber having a trapezoidal form in a cross section; and Collins et al do not teach Faraday shield being in floating position to a ground.

The Examiner argues that the dome shape as taught by Li et al and the claimed conical shape (trapezoidal cross section) are considered obvious variation for achieving the same effect. Regarding the Faraday shield being floating, Schneider et al teach that a Faraday shield may be left grounded or floating when an RF is applied to an induction coil.

Applicants assert that Lu et al do not teach a Faraday shield being in floating position to a ground.

The Examiner has revised the rejection using Schneider et al and Savas et al for teaching a Faraday shield being left at floating potential.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following arts disclose plasma processing apparatus including a plasma generating portion having an upper face having a smaller area than a lower face thereof wherein the upper faces is flat and an angle between the side faces of the plasma generating portion and a normal to the upper face having an angle more than 5 degrees and wherein the ration of the height of the plasma generating position to the radius of the upper face may be equal or less than one. Yoshioka et al (US Patent No. 6,034,346) (Fig. 3b); Cui et al (US Patent No. 5,965,463) (Figs. 2-3); Murugesh et al (US Patent No. 5,811,356) (Fig. 1); Nowak et al (US Patent No. 5,865,896) (Fig. 1); Yin et al (US Patent No. 5,540,824) (Fig. 2D); Ye et al (US Patent No. 6,071,372) (Figs. 4E, 4F); and Horioka et al (US Patent No. 6,132,551). Collins (US Patent No.

Art Unit: 1763

6,036,878) disclose the employment of a Faraday shield in different location of a plasma processing chamber; and

Daviet (US Patent No. 6,056,848) teach a Faraday shield (Fig. 2) which may be grounded or being left floating.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Parviz Hassanzadeh whose telephone number is (703)308-2050. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (703)308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9310 for regular communications and (703)872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

P. Hassanzadeh
Parviz Hassanzadeh
Examiner
Art Unit 1763

May 21, 2003